

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: *DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2012-029-DNA*

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: *AZA-35962*

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: *Cemex Table Mesa Mineral Materials Sale*

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: *T. 7 N., R. 2 E., Sec. 3*

APPLICANT (if any): *Cemex Construction Materials*

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Issue a mineral materials sale contract for 300,000 tons of materials from an existing active mineral materials mining operation. Action allows for ongoing operations to continue. Minimal to no change in area of surface disturbance and footprint will remain within original area of authorized activity. Lands are State of Arizona surface with Federal minerals. Contract stipulations attached.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Bradshaw-Harquahala RMP

Date Approved/Amended: 4/22/2010

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

MI-2. Except for legislatively withdrawn areas and other withdrawn and segregated areas, open all public lands within the planning area to mineral materials disposal, on a case-by-case-basis.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

EA AZ-020-2001-0034

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Proposed action is substantially the same as and within the area analyzed in EA AZ-020-2001-0034. The only new surface disturbance would result from the few feet the quarry headwall would migrate as a result of the additional mining. New disturbance remains within the originally authorized area of activities.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Range of alternatives previously analyzed in EA AZ-020-2001-0034 is appropriate to the new proposed action.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

The proposed action is consistent with actions previously covered and reviewed in Environmental Assessment AZ-020-2001-0034.

Subjects which were not addressed at the time of the original EA are as follows:

Energy Impact – The proposed action will have no impact on the development, production, supply and/or distribution of energy resources.

Environmental Justice – In compliance with Executive Order 12898, the Phoenix Field Office identified no minority or low-income populations that could be disproportionately affected by the proposed action. The BLM determined that there is no significant number of minorities or low income populations identified living in the affected area.

Invasive, Nonnative Weeds – The Bureau policy regarding management of invasive, nonnative weeds as found in “Partners Against Weeds (PAW) Action Plan, January 1996”, states that “an analysis of the potential for weed spread must be examined and established as an environmental consequence of proposed actions. Measures and stipulations to minimize the spread of weeds must be provided. This contract includes a standard stipulation to address invasive weeds.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

The direct and indirect impacts of the current proposal are substantially unchanged. Proposed actions are a logical continuation of those previously covered in Environmental Assessment AZ-020-2001-0034. No new areas are involved as all affected lands were covered by the existing EA.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Previous NEPA documents did not require public involvement or interagency review and none was conducted.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
See attached list	<u>Insert title</u>	<u>Insert resource/agency</u>

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents

CONCLUSION:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

_____/S/_____
David L. Eddy

_____/S/_____
Leah Baker

_____/S/_____
D. Remington Hawes

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.